



- 1. Based on the review of topics recommended by the internal and external stakeholders, the following four breakout groups have been finalized:
  - Public Health Protection
  - Permit Structure and Process
  - Better Technology and Cost Effectiveness
  - Fees

Details of breakout groups including final list of topics, Air Quality Permitting Program (AQPP) facilitators, and internal and external group members, are provided in Attachment I.

- 2. The Stack Testing breakout group will now be an independent group, outside the Permitting Transformation, working under Mike Klein of Bureau of Technical Services.
- 3. The Fees breakout group will meet after the completion of LEAN process that is currently underway in AQPP. As requested by some stakeholders, AQPP will provide a write-up regarding emission fees stabilization (based on Connecticut model) being considered by AQPP for program funding.
- 4. The breakout groups are charged with performing a detailed review of topics finalized by the stakeholders (listed in Attachment I), determining how to implement each suggestion, identifying impediments to making the changes, while factoring input from <u>all</u> participants. The breakout groups will summarize its solution(s) for each of the suggestions. These solutions, and input from stakeholders will be used to develop a draft proposal for consideration.

These draft proposals will be brought back to the entire external stakeholders group where the group will review the conclusions of the breakout group. The group as a whole will review and react to each proposal with the goal of obtaining final input to the proposals. Stakeholder involvement from all sectors is valued and will be considered, however, involvement of any sector does not imply that the participating stakeholder has endorsed any final product or suggestion.

The Department will draft a formal whitepaper which will include all of the suggestions and proposed solutions and the reaction from the stakeholders on each. The Department will consider all the input and act upon each as appropriate.

5. Any additional topic (not included in the attachment) will be considered only when the entire external workgroup meet to discuss outcome of the breakout groups. This approach will ensure that all stakeholders, including AQPP staff, focus on the priority areas identified for this phase of transformation to improve the program's efficiency and effectiveness.

3/10/2011





6. New comments received via e-mails after Feb 11, 2011 meeting were discussed and most were included in the breakout group task list as described below.

Additional Topic		Action	
1.	Develop more flexible and user friendly permitting	Include in Breakout Group # 2 as	
	process for minor sources.	additional language in 2(a).	
2.	The Department should consider restructuring to	PARKING LOT	
	combine permitting and enforcement.		
3.	The NJEMS database should be upgraded for	Include in Breakout Group # 2 as	
	better interface to populate forms and upload	additional language in 2(k). May	
	applications. (For example, use of newer Excel	need to wait until LEAN process is	
	based interface to populate forms and	completed and/or Office of	
	upload/submit an application.)	Information Resources Management	
		(OIRM) review.	
4.	Develop procedures to modify permits for like-	Include in Breakout Group # 2 as	
	kind replacement of equipment when there is no	additional language in 2(1).	
	increase in emissions.		
5.	The Department should use discretion to require	Include in Breakout Group # 3 as	
	state of the art controls/technology while	additional language in 3(a).	
	approving Title V renewals.		





#### **Attachment I**

#### Breakout Group # 1: Public Health Protection

NJDEP Facilitator: John Preczewski, Assistant Director, AQPP

**NJDEP Members**: Joel Leon and Olga Boyko

**Stakeholders:** Michelle Smith, Amy Goldsmith, Mike Lutz, Joann held

Tasks		Rating <sup>1</sup>	Assigned to
1(a).	There is a need for the Department to make emission data	С	NJDEP
	available in a form readily understandable by the public.		
1(b).	On its own initiative, the Department should develop a	C	John
	community-wide cumulative impact analysis, including		Preczewski/
	minor sources.		Joann Held
1(c).	The Department should make effort to identify facilities and	D*	NJDEP
	emission points without permits, particularly in		
	Environmental Justice areas.		
1(d).	The Department should review the current applicability	С	Olga Boyko
	threshold and revise it based upon latest scientific		
	information.		
1(e).	The cumulative risk analysis and health risk assessment	С	Bart Cassidy
	process should be developed prior to applying it to the		•
	permitting process.		
1(f).	Minor source permit renewals should be screened; selected	С	Joann Held/
	minor source renewals should receive a detailed review and		Bob Kettig
	enforcement inspection.		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Rating

A: Ready to Go B: Desirable/Minor Effort C: Desirable/Major Effort D: Low Yield

D\*: Needs Referral to Air Compliance and Enforcement/NJDEP will revitalize EJ Process





## Breakout Group # 2: Permit Structure and Process

NJDEP Facilitator: Bachir Bouzid, Section Chief, Operating Permits Section

NJDEP Members: Bob Kettig, Mike Adhanom, Kevin Greener, and Khawar Kalim

**Stakeholders:** Jim Connolly, Mark Caine, Michelle Smith, Peter Haid, Tony Russo, Dan

Cunningham, Toby Hanna, Bob Heil, Doug Lafayette, Amy Goldsmith, Steve Oliver, Bart Cassidy, Richelle Wormley, Pradeep Lamba, Michelle

Smith, Dena Mottola Jaborska

Tasks		Rating <sup>1</sup>	Assigned to
2(a).	There is a need to look at other states' permit format for improvements to NJDEP's and make the permits more user	A	Steve Oliver
	friendly and easy to understand by public, industry and		
	enforcement. Develop more flexible and user friendly		
	permitting process for minor sources.		
2(b).	Consider streamlining permits by only including the most stringent requirements.	A	Khawar Kalim
2(c).	Monitoring and recordkeeping requirements should be	С	Peter Haid/
2(0).	simplified. Duplicative or redundant monitoring should be		Doug Lafayette
	eliminated. Monitoring not specified in rule should not be		Boug Eurayette
	specified in the permit. While revisiting permit requirements		
	for minor sources, include critical requirements for		
	environmental quality without overburdening the		
	recordkeeping and monitoring requirements.		
2(d).	Level of monitoring should be proportioned to history of		Dan
	enforcement compliance. Identify facilities in good	С	Cunningham
	standing. Provide incentives to facilities with a good		
	compliance history by offering a reduced permitting burden.		
2(e).	Incorporate by reference.	В	Toby Hanna/
			Steve Oliver
2(f).	Permit application supplemental information, not directly	В	Peter Haid/
	related to emissions, should not become permit		Doug Lafayette
	requirements.		
2(g).	Redefine what an insignificant source in NJ Title V program	C	Frank Steitz
2(1)	is.	<b>D</b>	D 1 11 11/4 1
2(h).	Hold on-site pre/post application meetings.	В	Bob Heil/Andy
2(:)	Off Discription of the Control of th	D.	Tynan
2(i).	Offer Plant-wide Applicability Limits (PAL).	D	Ketan
			Bhandutia/
2(:)	Develop Consul Operation Develop (COD) Office in	C	Andy Tynan
2(j).	Develop General Operating Permits (GOP). Otherwise	С	Kevin Greener

3/10/2011





	make equipment that is currently eligible for general permits, insignificant Title V sources (see 2(g) above)		
2(k).	Shorten the processing time for permit approval. Refocus the permit review effort. + The NJEMS database should be upgraded for better interface to populate forms and upload applications. (For example, use of newer Excel based interface to populate forms and upload/submit an application.)	В	PARKING LOT
2(1).	Classify more significant modifications as minor modifications. + Develop procedures to modify permits for like-kind replacement of equipment when there is no increase in emissions.	С	Bart Cassidy
2(m).	Minimize the number of appeals.	С	Bachir Bouzid

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Rating

A: Ready to Go B: Desirable/Minor Effort C: Desirable/Major Effort D: Low Yield





## Breakout Group # 3: Better Technology and Cost Effectiveness

NJDEP Facilitator: Frank Steitz, Chief, BAP

**NJDEP Members**: Peg Gardner

Stakeholders: Tony Russo, Amy Goldsmith, Toby Hanna, Steve Oliver, and Mike Lutz

Tasks		Rating <sup>1</sup>	Assigned to
3(a).	Air Permitting should adopt a policy of ratcheting down	С	Peg Gardner
	emissions similar to the water program. + The Department		
	should use discretion to require state of the art		
	controls/technology while approving Title V renewals.		
3(b).	The Department should clarify the process for case by case	В	Peg Gardner
	state of the art analysis, presumptive norms etc.		
3(c).	The Department should establish cost effectiveness	C	Peg Gardner
	thresholds when developing RACT, SOTA etc.		
3(d).	Health costs should be included in any effectiveness	С	Peg Gardner
	analysis.		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Rating

A: Ready to Go B: Desirable/Minor Effort C: Desirable/Major Effort D: Low Yield





## Breakout Group # 4: Fees

NJDEP Facilitator: Frank Steitz, Chief, BAP

NJDEP Members: Ketan Bhandutia and Khawar Kalim

**Stakeholders:** Mark Caine, Tony Russo, Toby Hanna, Doug Lafayette, Dan

Cunningham, Mike Lutz, Richelle Wormley, and Dena Mottola Jaborska

Tasks		Rating <sup>1</sup>	Assigned to
4(a).	Air Quality Permitting Program needs to be openly	С	On hold until
	evaluated and made more efficient.		LEAN is
			completed
4(b).	Once an appropriate program level has been identified	C	Khawar
	through (a) above, an appropriate funding mechanism need		Kalim
	be developed.		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Rating

A: Ready to Go B: Desirable/Minor Effort C: Desirable/Major Effort D: Low Yield